



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

insular prejudices and to write in the attitude of dispassionate criticism. In the main he has succeeded.

The incidents of the French Revolution are so theatrical that it has seemed difficult for the most sober historians to abstain from coloring their pictures, and from throwing a far too lurid light upon events which, separated from their connection with the movement at large, are really of minor importance. Mr. Rose's work is quite free from this defect, as is particularly to be seen in his account of the storming of the Bastille.

His treatment of the Napoleonic Era is praiseworthy so far as the narrative is concerned, but his conception of the character of Napoleon is not so satisfactory. He assumes throughout almost a hostile attitude toward the great French leader. His praise is grudgingly bestowed, and his criticisms of Napoleon's plans and actions are at times unreasonably harsh. One is constantly reminded while reading this portion of the book, that the writer is an Englishman, with an Englishman's inherited prejudices.

Taken as a whole, however, Mr. Rose's work may well rank with that of Mr. Stephens. The two books are substantial additions to the library of the general student of history. C. E. CHADSEY.

DURANGO, COLORADO.

Selections from the Correspondence of Thomas Barclay, formerly British Consul-General at New York. Edited by GEORGE LOCKHART RIVES, M.A., late Assistant Secretary of State of the United States. New York, Harper & Brothers, 1894. — 429 pp.

This volume exhibits an advance in thought, if not in time, beyond the managers of a certain historical society, who, in printing the diary of a Revolutionary character, carefully omitted the passages in which a member of a well-known family was spoken of as a Tory. Thomas Barclay "was an active and zealous loyalist." He was born in the city of New York in 1753; he died there in 1830. He died, as he was born, a British subject. He spent nearly fifty years in the service of the British government; yet his residence and associations were chiefly American, and his principal public services related to American affairs.

About six months after the battle of Lexington Thomas Barclay was married and took up his residence in Ulster County, where his wife's maternal grandfather, Cadwallader Colden, owned large tracts of land. His father, Henry Barclay, as rector of Trinity Church, represented

that bulwark of the monarchy, the English Church; and although he died when his son Thomas was scarcely eleven years of age, it is doubtless true, as the editor surmises, that the boy was taught to believe "the Church of England the embodiment of all spiritual truth, the young king the ablest and best of rulers, and the system of government administered by Cadwallader Colden the perfection of human reason." Thomas Barclay's loyalist attachments led to his being driven from his home in Ulster; but instead of going to England and becoming a "drone," he joined the royal army, in which he served with great credit. At the close of the war, however, he found himself proscribed and his property confiscated; and he sought refuge in Nova Scotia, where he soon became a member of the provincial assembly and afterwards its speaker. In 1793 he was appointed lieutenant-colonel of the Royal Nova Scotia Regiment.

In 1796 Colonel Barclay was commissioned by the king as British commissioner or arbitrator, under article five of the Jay Treaty, to determine what river was intended under the name of the St. Croix, in the treaty of peace of 1783. This was the first of the transactions, beginning with the treaty of 1794 and ending with the treaty of 1871, by which the northern boundary of the United States has been determined. Americans claimed an eastern river, named the Magaguadavic, as that intended by the name St. Croix; the British claimed a western river, named the Schoodic or Schodiac. The latter was accepted as the river truly intended, but a compromise was made as to the waters that constituted its source. In this transaction Thomas Barclay bore a leading part, as is shown by his correspondence. Having examined the fragmentary papers on the subject in the Department of State, I am glad to find in this correspondence a clear and connected account of how the compromise was reached.

In January, 1799, Colonel Barclay was appointed to succeed Sir John Temple, deceased, as British consul-general for the Eastern States of America. He now returned to New York; and on his arrival he encountered a question—that of the desertion of seamen—which has only lately been made the subject of a conventional arrangement between the United States and Great Britain. To meet the difficulties occasioned by the numerous desertions at the port of New York, the legislature of the state passed an act to authorize the arrest of deserters. The act, however, was thrown out by the Council of Revision, on the ground that it was a commercial regulation, which pertained to the Federal Congress.

As the days passed by, the events leading up to the war of 1812 began to develop. Complaints of impressment became frequent. British vessels hovered on the American coast, and in some instances boarded American vessels within the marine league. For a time the port of New York was virtually blockaded. In April, 1806, the British man-of-war *Leander*, while firing at an American coaster, killed the man at the helm. In the same month the first non-importation act was passed. Soon afterward French decrees and British orders-in-council began to vex neutral commerce. In June, 1807, occurred the attack of the *Leopard* on the *Chesapeake*. At the end of the same year came the embargo. Then followed the non-intercourse acts, and in time the war. These topics are all embraced in the correspondence before us.

At the outbreak of the war Colonel Barclay, his official functions being in suspense, went to England; but he was immediately appointed as British agent for prisoners of war in the United States. In this capacity he returned in April, 1813, to New York. In the following month he concluded with a representative of the United States at Washington, an arrangement in relation to the exchange of prisoners.

After the war Colonel Barclay returned to the post of consul-general at New York. His activities, however, were soon diverted into another channel. For the most part the boundaries between the United States and Great Britain remained to be marked or determined, and he was appointed as British commissioner under articles four and five of the Treaty of Ghent, to decide upon the title to Grand Menan and the islands of Passamaquoddy Bay, and to determine the boundary from the source of the St. Croix to the St. Lawrence. A formal award under article four was executed at New York, in November, 1817. But as to the boundary referred to in article five, from the source of the St. Croix to the St. Lawrence, the commissioners were unable to agree. Nor was this question settled till 1842, when Mr. Webster and Lord Ashburton made their famous treaty and adjusted it by a compromise.

The editorial work in this volume exhibits care that may fairly be called minute. Even the more obscure personal allusions in the letters are traced out and identified. But it is in the introductory observations, written in a clear, strong style, and forming a setting to each chapter of the correspondence, that the editor is especially happy.

J. B. MOORE.